

Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)

Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—26

Becerra
Berry
Brown (OH)
Doggett
Flake
Goode
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)

Hulshof
Jones (NC)
Kennedy (MN)
Kind
Kleczka
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Matheson
Paul

Petri
Ramstad
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Stearns
Tanner

NOT VOTING—14

Cramer
Edwards
Fossella
Gephardt
Gibbons

Goss
Harman
Janklow
Millender
McDonald

Murtha
Owens
Pickering
Portman
Wicker

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1921

Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. FLAKE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, because of an emergency in my district, I missed rollcall vote Nos. 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344 and 345. If present I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote Nos. 337, 338 and 341 and "yea" on rollcall vote Nos. 339, 340, 342, 343, 344 and 345.

REPORT ON H.R. 2673, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. BONILLA, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-193) on the bill (H.R. 2673) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FISCAL YEAR 2004 BUDGET REQUEST ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-99)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without

objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with my constitutional authority and sections 202(c) and (e) of the District of Columbia Financial Management and Responsibility Assistance Act of 1995 and section 446 of the District of Columbia Self-Governmental Reorganization Act as amended in 1989, I am transmitting the District of Columbia's Fiscal Year 2004 Budget Request Act.

The proposed Fiscal Year 2004 Budget Request Act reflects the major programmatic objectives of the Mayor and the Council of the District of Columbia. For Fiscal Year 2004, the District estimates total revenues and expenditures of \$5.6 billion.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 9, 2003.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TIME TO FACE THE FACTS ON IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, last fall I stood out in front of the Cannon Building and said I believed that we might indeed be misled by our leaders in the stampede to go to war against Iraq. When I was in Iraq a few weeks later, I was interviewed by "ABC This Week" and asked if I stood by that statement. I said I did. I got death threats for saying that.

Well, folks, it is time to face the facts. The American people were misled and Members of Congress were misled. But who misled us? Apparently we were misled by the White House speechwriters. I do not know.

I do not question that the motive was to do what they sincerely believed would be the best thing for our country. I do not question that they be-

lieved and still believe going to war against Iraq was the right thing to do.

But for those who would not have supported this war save for the official dossiers and intelligence and information they relied on, my friends, you were misled.

Those who believed that whatever the President said would have been carefully confirmed and who never doubted that what the President said in the State of the Union Address would have been gone over with a fine-tooth comb, my friends, you were misled.

So far, 212 young Americans have died in Iraq. Someone will die tonight and tomorrow and the day after. And now what? Now the administration does not even claim that weapons of mass destruction will be found. Instead, we are told that evidence of a program that would have eventually created weapons will be found.

This afternoon, today, according to Reuters, Mr. Rumsfeld, the Secretary of War, told the Senate Armed Services Committee that there was nothing new going on in Iraq. He said there was "no dramatic new evidence," just old evidence seen in a new light.

Is that the impression you had? I ask, because that is not what I heard. I heard urgency. I heard new revelation after new revelation. I heard that we were in imminent danger.

The fact that nothing that we expected, nothing like storehouses of terrifying weapons has been found, certainly backs up Mr. Rumsfeld's contention.

What we found are mass graves in Iraq, body upon body, people killed for no reason by the government of Saddam Hussein. So this is where the administration is turning to justify its actions in Iraq.

The United States has never, never invaded a foreign country simply to get rid of an evil dictator. That is not what our young people signed up to give their lives for. That is not what our taxpayers have given their money for. That is not what America does. At least until now.

Well, our troops in Iraq, these fine young people went into the service to protect America, not to bring democracy to someone else's country, not to stop human rights abuses or get rid of dictators, because if that was the basis of our military policy, there are a lot of governments out there that we would be ready to overthrow.

□ 1930

Not to get rid of a bad guy because we are tired of messing around with containment. They enlisted to protect our country. What did our country need protection from? From biological and chemical weapons that could be launched within 45 minutes? Apparently not. From a nuclear arms program that was not just an aspiration of a madman, but was so far along that it was importing uranium from Niger? Apparently not. The President denied

that today. From gallons of nerve gas and rooms full of test tubes and trailers full of equipment so sophisticated that biological and chemical weapons could be pumped out on Saddam's command? Apparently not that, either.

We had a policy with regard to Iraq. It was a frustrating policy, but it was working. It is the same policy President Reagan used on the Soviet Union: containment. We had an embargo in place that the rest of the world supported. We had U.N. inspectors in place that the rest of the world supported. They did not have as long to look for weapons as our people have now had, but they were looking, and while they were in Iraq, Saddam was not going to be able to fulfill any of his evil dreams.

Containment worked from the end of the Gulf War until the day we invaded. If you believe that the United States should go to war to get rid of dictators who would most likely want to have weapons of mass destruction if they were not watched closely, I will give you a list. If you believe the United States should go to war to get rid of dictators who have people tortured, I will give you another list. If you believe that the United States should go to war bringing democracy to someone else's country is a mission worth the lives of our young soldiers, I will give you a list.

But if you share the belief of John Quincy Adams, the sixth President of the United States, that our country is blessed, in part, because "she does not go abroad in search of monsters to destroy," I say to my colleagues, we were all misled, and it is time for us to have a bipartisan committee, select committee, to look at this issue and find out who was it that misled us?

I read in the paper today that Mr. Blair gave us some bad information, and our President took it, swallowed it hook, line and sinker, and now says, I did not know; it was Blair that gave me this bad information. Mr. Blair answered questions for 2½ hours before the Parliament of the United Kingdom. We ought to have that kind of thing going on here.

COMPETITIVE TENSION WILL LOWER DRUG PRICES FOR AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise again tonight to talk about the high price that Americans pay for prescription drugs relative to the rest of the world. I have with me a chart, and some of my colleagues have seen this chart, and I apologize, it is a little hard to read for the Members who are watching in their offices on C-SPAN, but what it really shows us are 10 of the most commonly prescribed drugs that I and my staff purchased when we were in Germany about 2 months ago

at the Munich Airport Pharmacy, and then a comparison of what those drugs sell for here in the United States.

Let me just read for my colleagues what some of those prices are. Cipro, a drug that we learned a lot about when we had anthrax here in the Capitol complex, is a very effective antibiotic, made by a company called Bayer. They also make aspirin and a lot of other drugs. The price in Germany for 10 tablets, 250 milligrams: \$35.12. That same Cipro here in the United States: \$55.05.

A drug that my father takes, Coumadin, is a blood thinner. Some of my colleagues say, well, we cannot open up markets because people might get rat poisoning. Mr. Speaker, Coumadin is rat poisoning. It was developed at the University of Wisconsin veterinary schools, and it sells under the generic name of Warfarin. But Coumadin in the United States, and my father takes it, the price for 100 tablets, 5 milligrams in the United States: \$89.95. In Germany you can buy that same Coumadin for \$21.

Glucophage is a very commonly prescribed drug for people who have borderline diabetes. In the United States the price is \$29.95 for 30 tablets. In Germany we bought that drug for \$5.

Another drug that we paid for, the taxpayers, you paid for this drug, Tamoxifen, a very amazing anti-breast-cancer drug, we paid about, I think the number was over \$500 million through the NIH to develop and take the drug through phase 2 trials. We pay in the United States \$360. They buy that drug in Germany for 60 bucks. Now, we paid for the development, and now, apparently, we are paying for the marketing, the advertising and, ultimately, for the profit on that drug.

The bottom line is these 10 drugs bought in Munich, Germany, the total price in dollars: \$373.30. Those same drugs bought here in the United States: \$1,039.65.

My colleagues do not have to take my word for it. Today, like Diogenes, I finally found an honest person inside the administration who will talk honestly about what we pay for drugs. She is an IG, an inspector general, in the Department of Health and Human Services. Her name is Dara Corrigan. She testified before the Committee on the Budget today. She said that Medicare last year spent about \$8.2 billion on drugs, drugs that are administered in hospitals. She said, according to her research, that the Medicare people paid \$1.9 billion more than they would have had to pay for the same drugs had they bought them through the VA.

Now, I asked her, had they or anybody done any comparisons between how much Medicare is currently paying or will pay as we move down the road towards a prescription drug benefit under Medicare; how much would they pay if they could have bought those drugs from pharmacies right off the rack in Germany or Switzerland or some other industrialized country?

The bottom line is this, I say to my colleagues: We need to do something

about this, because it is not so much shame on the pharmaceutical industry, although it is hard for me to defend this. I am a Republican; I believe that profit is a good word. But profiteering is a bad word, and somehow we have to come to grips and create a market environment so that we have competitive prices, because Americans deserve world-class drugs, but they deserve to be able to buy those drugs at world-market prices.

So my answer may not be the best answer, but at least it is an answer: to bring an element of competition, competitive tension, into the prices that we pay relative to the rest of the world.

I believe that Americans should pay their fair share of the cost of research, and I am proud of the fact that we do pay our fair share. In fact, I think we ought to be able to subsidize, we ought to be willing to subsidize the people in sub-Saharan Africa, but I do not think we ought to have to subsidize the starving Swiss.

This is not just about economics, it is not just about the prices we pay. There is a moral undertone to this. I think, I say to my colleagues, it is time for us to take a very clear stand. The rumor is we may actually get a vote on this in the next week or 10 days. When we do, we are going to be asked, will we stand with the large pharmaceutical companies, or will we stand with our consumers? I hope we will give the right answer.

U.S. CAN NO LONGER AFFORD TO IGNORE AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, for the next week, Africa will be on page 1 news due to the President's trip to the continent. Then, once again, news on Africa will most likely recede to the back pages of our major newspapers and disappear for good. However, what many Americans do not realize is the increasing importance of Africa to the world and the United States.

Americans now import more than one-quarter of their oil from the African continent. In the coming years, due to new major oil discoveries in the Gulf of Guinea off the west coast of Africa, the percentage of African oil Americans consume will most likely rise. It will rise because there are quantities of untapped oil reserves on the continent, and it will rise because the United States realizes that oil from the Middle East can easily fall prey to the vagaries of wars and politics.

Africa is so important to us, in part, because it is a continent rich in natural resources. Copper, diamonds, gold, and wood are all in abundance throughout the continent. The Congo River itself has enough potential hydroelectric power to supply the electrical needs of the whole continent. And the